



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HEBREW TRIBAL NAMES AND THE PRIMITIVE TRADITIONS OF ISRAEL.

I.

IF any shortcoming can be found in Mr. G. Buchanan Gray's instructive book (*Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*), it is that, in accordance with the plan of his investigation, he has attached less importance to tribal than to personal names, although it is the former which possess the higher significance for the origin of history and religion.

In a previous essay (*J. Q. R.*, X, p. 662) I have endeavoured to explain the Divine Name יהוה by referring it to the same class with such names as יעקב and יוסף, and interpreting the whole group as formulae of invocation of the tribal deity. I now propose to inquire whether the names of the twelve tribes may not also be in part interpreted upon a similar hypothesis, to consider some historical results arising from this supposition, and to discuss the significance of certain names, analogous to these or traditionally associated with them, which will naturally present themselves for examination in the course of the inquiry.

It is generally recognized that two of the tribal names of Israel are those of the deities Gad and Asher. The former need not detain us, except to note the importance of the fact that a Hebrew tribe should derive its very name from a Syrian and Phoenician god (see Cheyne, *P. I.*, lxv. 11). But the latter deserves closer attention, for it is really impossible to suppose that the worship of אֲשֵׁר was

unconnected with that of the אֲשֶׁרָה. Grammatically, the two terms are related precisely as אֵל is to אֱלֹהִים, and it is difficult to avoid supposing that the latter was the symbol of the former, the "tree" the dwelling of the god. But we know from Deut. xvi. 21 that the אֲשֶׁרָה was associated with the altar of יְהוָה. And as we cannot suppose that either the cultus of יְהוָה or that of the אֲשֶׁרָה was unknown to this particular tribe, we are led to the conclusion that for the Asherite the worship of Asher was equated with that of Jahveh. And it would seem from Isa. lxv. 11 (Cheyne, *Introd. Isa.*, p. 365) that a similar syncretism marked the cult of Gad. Both these deities were gods of fortune, whom the shepherd and the tiller of the soil might alike invoke to bestow fruit upon their labours. No student of the Old Testament will need to be reminded of the importance which this material prosperity—say rather, this *daily bread*—possessed for the religion of Israel. Its source was one of the leading points in dispute in the long controversy between the prophets and the people. It is sufficient to refer to Hos. ii. 5 b, 8, 12; Deut. xxviii. 4; Jer. xlv. 17, 18. The name of the Asherah indicates that it was regarded as a source of fortune, and as every reader of *The Golden Bough* is aware, the prosperity of crops and flocks is just what is sought in the worship of the tree-spirit.

Now I have previously shown (*J. Q. R.*, VIII, p. 704; X, 489) that at Beer-sheba the tamarisk was associated with the cultus of יְהוָה אֵל עֵלָם, that the same tree was also sacred to Osiris, that it was known to the Egyptians under its Semitic name (Heb. אֲשֶׁל), that the Didu—the symbol of the Egyptian god—was analogous in its nature to the Hebrew Asherah, that at Byblus on the Syrian coast the worship of Osiris was identified with that of Adonis, that "in inscriptions Osiris is referred to as 'the one in the tree,' 'the solitary one in the acacia'" (probably the כֹּנֵה of Exod. iii. 2), and that his worship under that title is apparently denounced in Isa. lxvi. 17. But the persons who worship Osiris-Adonis in Isa. lxvi are presumably

the same who in the preceding chapter make offerings to Gad and to Meni. We are here well within a circle of beliefs and rites common to the nations surrounding Israel, and the settlement of the tribe of Asher on the borders of Phoenicia must have exposed it to these influences in a peculiar degree. Is it going too far to conjecture that the cultus of Asher was related, both name and thing, to that of Osiris? Some confirmation of this view may be derived from the singular name of an Asherite clan or town אֲשֶׁרֶץ (1 Chron. vii. 36) which admits of being interpreted "Horus the Good," the son of Osiris.

The names of Simeon and Levi received from Robertson-Smith an interpretation in terms of totemism, the latter being brought into connexion with that of Leah (*Kinship*, p. 30 and note, p. 257, also pp. 195, 219, 220. For Simeon see Jacobs, *Archaeol. Rev.*, III, 153). If this view be accepted it is in complete harmony with the general hypothesis that tribal names are appellations of tribal deities. But at present we are suffering a reaction from the charms of totemism, and in the case of Simeon and Levi I cannot regard this interpretation as necessary. If שִׁמְעוֹן be derived from the root שָׁמַע, it may be explained on the analogy of שָׁמַע (LXX *τύχη*) as equivalent to *ἀνάγκη*; or it may refer to the obligations of religion; or to the "binding of a god¹," with a possible allusion to the Ark of Jahveh; or, lastly, it may express the attachment conceived to exist between the community and its *old ally*².

The name שִׁמְעוֹן "Hearer," may fairly be regarded as the correlative of שְׁמַעֲתָא "God hear!" For the form compare שְׁמַעֲתָא, Gen. xiv. 18, while the meaning of both names may be illustrated by those of David's sons שְׁמוּעָה (a noun of the *qāttūl* formation) and אֱלִי שְׁמַע "God hath heard!" 2 Sam. v. 14, 16. Cf. Ps. lxxv. 3 שְׁמַע תִּפְלֶה.

With שִׁמְעוֹן thus interpreted may be classed וְיִזְבֵּן, and

¹ See Mr. Crooke's valuable paper, *Folk Lore*, VIII, 325; also Lang, *The Making of Religion*, p. 282, "binding charms, λεγόμεναι θεῶν ἀνάγκαι."

² See Note: the Name of Levi, p. 264 below.

I would add יְשֻׁרִן. Both the significance of the names themselves, and the analogy of the preceding examples, render it probable that the Exalted and the Upright were in the first instance appellations of deities rather than mere names of tribes. The word זָבַל is applied in 1 Kings viii. 13 to the earthly, and in Isa. lxiii. 15 to the heavenly dwelling of Jahveh; and as Canon Cheyne points out in his critical note on the latter passage, the בֵּית זָבַל of 1 Kings viii. 13 is described as עֲלִיין in ix. 8. It seems a fair inference that זָבַל (אֵל) may be equivalent to עֲלִיין אֵל, and it is not improbable that זָבַל the *praepositus* of Shechem in Judges ix derived his name from the same divine appellation. So too in אֵיזָבַל the latter part of the name is probably a predicate of בָּעַל (v. *Lex.*), and in the New Testament Βεελεβεούλ (N B Βεεξεβεούλ) appears as ruler or chief of evil spirits. In an earlier age he may have been ruler of the gods. Canon Cheyne has justly interpreted his name "lord of the (heavenly) height."

Before leaving this branch of the subject it may be worth while to note that not only is the Heb. בֵּית זָבַל equivalent to the Assyrian *bît zabal*, "lofty house" (*Lex.*), but "the Accadian *sag-il* or *sag-gâ*, lit. 'high head,' is explained by the Syrian *zabal*" (Cheyne, *sup. cit.*), and the great temple of Bel-Merodach at Babylon, whose immense ruins still bear the name of Babel, was called Ê-Saggila (Sayce, *Primer of Assyriology*):—

The temples were miniature reproductions of the arrangement of the universe. The "Ziggurat" represented in its form the mountain of the world, and the halls ranged at its feet resembled approximately the accessory parts of the world: the temple of Merodach at Babylon comprised them all up to the chambers of fate, where the sun received every morning the tablets of destiny. . . . This idea, analogous to that which had determined the distribution of the Egyptian temples, arose from the form of the mountain which the Chaldeans gave to their temples, and from the name "Ekur," a common designation of temples and the earth. . . . The earth rises gradually from the extremities to the centre, like a great mountain, of which the snow-region, where

the Euphrates finds its source, approximately marks the summit. It was at first supposed to be divided into seven zones, placed one on the top of the other along its sides, like the stories of a temple. (Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, pp. 543, 674.)

It is the *Kharsag kurkura*, the "Mountain of the World" of the cuneiform texts, which is usually placed at the north or to the east, more accurately to the north-east. Jensen seems to me to have proved that this was a name used to indicate the earth itself. (*Ibid.*, p. 543, note 3.)

An analogous conception appears in the mythical cosmogony of India, "Mount Meru," if I may trust my memory on this point. It was suggested, we may fairly suppose, in the former case by the high mountains of Armenia and Kurdistan, in the latter by the world-topping Himmaleh. It appears again, in a very striking manner, in Isa. xiv. 13, 14: וַאֲתָה אָמַרְתָּ בְּלִבְּכֶךָ הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶעֱלֶה מִמֶּעַל לְכֹכְבֵי אֵל אֲרִים כִּסְאִי : 13, 14: וְאֵשֶׁב בְּהָר מוֹעֵד בִּירְכָתִי צֶפֶן : אֶעֱלֶה עַל בְּמֹתַי עַב אֲדַמָּה לְעֵלְיוֹן : אֶךְ אֵל שְׂאוֹל תּוֹרֵד אֵל יִרְכָתִי בּוֹר.

The same antithesis occurs apparently in Ps. xlix. 15 if we read with Cheyne שְׂאוֹל לְעוֹלָם וְבָל לֹ, and in Ps. xlviii. 3 the phrase יִרְכָתִי צֶפֶן is transferred bodily by a significant gloss to the הָר צִיּוֹן. These passages point, I think, to the conclusion that the mythical וְבָל is the dwelling of עֵלְיוֹן, and that וְבָל and בְּעַל וְבָל were originally equivalent to the latter deity, the Zeus of a Semitic Olympus. In a later age Mount Zion itself assumed the Olympian character (cp. especially Isa. ii. 2; Ezek. xl. 2 with Davidson's note, and Cheyne on Isa. xi. 9, *Introd. Isa.*, p. 67). But the expression בֵּית וְבָל is applied by Solomon to the temple in a poetical citation which is probably derived from the סֵפֶר הַיִּשָּׁר (*O. T. J. C.*, 2nd ed., Note B). And if we may rely on Gen. xiv, a late document which derived its historical data from Babylonian sources, then אֵל עֵלְיוֹן was the god of Jerusalem in the time of Melchizedek. Finally, the myth of the וְבָל enables us to understand why the Tower of Babel was designed to reach the heavens¹.

¹ A reference should be added to Ezek. xxviii. 11-19 (where "Eden the

In Deut. xxxiii. 26 it is possible that אל ישראל retains its original force (reading בְּאֵל), and even the סֵפֶר הַיִּשָּׁר may more probably be understood as the "book of Jahveh" than as the "book of Israel" (cf. Num. xxi. 14; Isa. xxxiv. 16). It should be remarked that the epithets אֲשֶׁר and יִשָּׁר are perhaps to be explained in a physical sense by reference to such symbols as the אֲשֶׁרָה and the נֹס (*J. Q. R.*, X, p. 675 and note). The moral signification of these terms would then represent a secondary development. Their relation to the names of the great gods Asshur and Osiris is a problem which may repay the investigations of the Assyrian and Egyptian archaeologist.

From actual names of deities such as מְנִי, אֲשֶׁר and נֹר, and perhaps לֵוִי, from epithets by which, we may suppose, the deity was invoked, such as זְבוּלֹן and יִשְׂרָאֵל, שְׁמֵעוֹן and עֲלִיִּן—if indeed there be any real distinction between these two classes—we pass to names which express a predicate of the tribal god and imply a proposition with regard to him. Among the names of the twelve tribes I find but one which can with any probability be referred to the type of יַעֲקֹבָאֵל and יוֹסֵפָאֵל, consisting of a verb in the imperfect tense (or jussive mood) preceding or implying the divine subject. This single and doubtful instance is the name יִשְׁשַׁכָּר. The simplest interpretation of this formula יִשְׁשַׁכָּר "there's a reward!" equally with the readings יִשָּׂא שְׂכָר "he shall bear a reward," and יִשְׁכָּר "he shall be rewarded," may be taken to assert that the assistance of the god is hired by a pledge of the spoil (1 Sam. xv. 9, 15). For the interpretation שְׂכָר cf. Ex. xv. 3 יְהוָה אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה, but this is less appropriate than the rest.

The name דָּן has been preserved in the full form as the personal דְּנִיָּאל or דְּנִיאֵל. It may be explained either as a perfect of anticipated certainty, a shout of assumed victory, "God hath judged," or as a participle, the nominal ter-

garden of God" and "the holy mountain of God" are apparently identical, and the fall of Tyre resembles that of Babylon in Isa. xiv), and to the mount of vision in Matt. iv. 8.

mination '— being preserved by close juxtaposition with the subject, and the sense being that of the *fut. instans*, which, allowing for the difference in idiom between the two languages, may perhaps be best rendered by the English present, "God judgeth" *our cause* or *his people* (Gen. xxx. 6, xlix. 16; Deut. xxxii. 36). The punctuation דִּנְיָאל, even of the shorter form, favours the interpretation as a participle. To account for the *dagesh* in דִּנְיָאל it is only necessary to try and pronounce the word without it. In English it tends to become a dissyllable:—

A Daniel come to judgment!

The signification of the last two names may be illustrated from Ps. lviii. 12 אֶךְ פִּרִי לְצַדִּיק אֶךְ יֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים שְׁפָטִים בְּאֶרֶץ, where "the righteous probably are the Israelites as a nation" (Cheyne, in loc.).

[נִפְחָלִי] may be explained on the analogy of דִּנְיָאל, as a Niph'al participle (implying the same subject) in which the vowel of the preformative has escaped the usual attenuation. Its meaning, "God wrestleth," is equivalent to that of עִקֵּב.

פִּנְשָׁה is obviously a Pi'el participle. I would suggest that the original form may have been [נִפְנָה] "God lifteth up his people" (Ps. xxviii. 9). In all these cases it is the predicate which constitutes the distinctive appellation of the tribe or tribal god, and from the emphasis it thus receives precedes the subject, which at last was omitted altogether.

Unlike the preceding examples, אֶפְרַיִם, as the termination shows (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Eng. trans. § 88, c), is apparently a place-name, equivalent to אֶפְרָתָה or אֶפְרַת, for the individual member of the tribe was called an אֶפְרַתִּי. No doubt the Ephrathah in question was that associated with the tomb of Rachel. But in spite of the misleading gloss, Gen. xxxvi. 19 (see Addis, in loc.), xlvi. 7, it is not to be identified with Beth-lehem. "It is most unlikely that any early tradition should have placed the tomb of Rachel, the

mythical ancestress of the great northern tribes, in the territory of Judah" (Addis, *sup. cit.*). "The mention of 'Rachel's grave' here appears to show that it must have been situated on the north border of Benjamin, at no great distance from Beth-el" (Driver on 1 Sam. x. 2). And, we may add, from Ramah (Cheyne on Jer. xxxi. 15). Prof. G. A. Smith (*Hist. Geog.*, ed. 1894, p. 325, note 2) writes with reference to *הרא פראים* (*sic*), "Of course the name spread originally from the hill-country immediately north of Benjamin's territory, which fell to the tribe of Ephraim, and in which we must seek for the site of the *city called Ephraim* . . . perhaps the modern et-Taiyibeh." In 2 Sam. xiii. 23 we read of *בְּעַל הַצֹּר אֲשֶׁר עִם אֶפְרַיִם*, i. e. beside the city of that name. So far, so good; this is in agreement with the site assigned to *בְּעַל הַצֹּר*, if that be the modern Tell 'Asur (with *y*) (cf. Neh. xi. 33). But in the passage of Samuel, Lucian's Septuagint gives *Γορφαίμ*. In Joshua xv. 9 the Heb. text has *הַר עֶפְרַיִם*, and in 2 Chron. xiii. 19 *עֶפְרַיִם* with the marginal reading *עֶפְרַיִם*. Against this may be set the Greek of 2 Sam. xiii. 23 (B, *'Εφφαίμ*), 2 Chron. xiii. 19 (B, *'Εφφών*), and John xi. 54 *εἰς 'Εφφραίμ λεγομένην πόλιν* (W. H.). "It was," says Prof. Smith (*Hist. Geog.*, p. 352, note 4; cf. p. 254), "the Aphairema of 1 Macc. xi. 34; [Josephus] xiii. *Ant.* iv. 9, one of three toparchies taken from Samaria and added to Judaea . . . about 145 B.C." "The Talmud censures the substitution of *א* for *ע*, and disallows special classes of people from acting as readers 'because they speak the *alefs* like *ayns*, and the *ayns* like *alefs*'" (Dr. H. Hirschfeld, *J. Q. R.*, IV, p. 500). One is reminded of the "terrible news" in Catullus:—

Ionios fluctus postquam illuc Arrius isset
Iam non Ionios esse sed *Hionios*.

In spite of the obscurity which thus overhangs the city called Ephraim, we are not obliged to doubt its existence. But it is against analogy for a tribe to derive its name from a city, or to bear an appellation without religious significance.

I venture to suggest, in accordance with the etymology of אַפְרַיִם given in Gen. xli. 52 (הַפְרִי אֱלֹהִים) and with the analogy of אֶזְרָה ("a *nomen verbale* of Hiph'îl, answering to the Aramaic infinitive of the causal-stem 'Aph'êl" Ges.-K. § 85, b), that אֶפְרָתָה or אֶפְרַת (compare the forms of the 3rd sing. fem. perfect of verbs ל'ה, Ges.-K. § 75, i) is in fact an appellation of Rachel herself signifying "*her that maketh fruitful*," and that אַפְרַיִם, an expansion of אֶפְרָת, is the masculine equivalent. The mythical implications of these terms will be dealt with in a later part of this paper, in connexion with the legend of Rachel.

In Gen. xxxv. 18 we read how the dying mother bestowed upon her child the name בֶּן אֹנִי; but his father called him בְּנִימִן. A beautiful touch, but has it any historical significance? Did the tribe originally, and as a member of the house of Joseph, bear one name, and was another imposed upon it by the authority of Jacob, or of united Israel? Bearing in mind the significance of אֹן, as in בֵּית אֹן, Hos. iv. 15 et al., and the situation of 'Anathoth within the territory of the tribe, with Isaiah's play upon the name בֶּן אֹנִי (עֲנִיָּה, al. 30 x), I am inclined to regard בֶּן אֹנִי as a possible substitute for בֶּן עֲנַת. In the Song of Deborah (Jud. v. 6) we hear of שִׁמְרֵן בֶּן עֲנַת, and in iii. 31 he appears among the "Minor Judges." Moore and Ruben incline to see in him a foreign oppressor. Is it possible the name should be read שִׁמְרֵן?

Again, comparing ראובן with the *Ρούβηλος* of Josephus (Gray, *Heb. Pr. Names*, p. 66, note 3) and the clan-name רְעוּלָא (Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 4, P; Midian, Ex. ii. 18; see Addis, p. 107), also רְעוּ in Gen. xi. 18 (P), I would suggest that the original name of the tribe may have been רְעוּבֵעַל. Confirmation or disproof of such hypotheses must be sought in their implications. Before considering these it will be well to take into account the significance of the last and most important name among the twelve, that of the tribe יְהוּדָה.

Here, and here alone, I find an explicit reference to the cultus of Jahveh. The interpretation given in Gen. xxix. 35

יהודה ותאמר הפעם אודה את יהוה על כן קראה שמו יהודה, I think, been misapprehended both by Mr. Spurrell and the compilers of the Oxford lexicon. The meaning of the writer, if I mistake not, is simply that יה הִנֵּה = יהודה. The final ה of יה coalesces with the initial ה of הודה, and as a consequence the vowel of the divine name (really that of the preformative of יהוה) suffers volatilization as it loses the accent. It will not, I think, be alleged that the vowel should be lengthened in compensation for the omitted doubling! We have to deal with a matter of usage, not of grammatical form, the usage of an invocation once shouted in war, but in time (its meaning forgotten) passing into a familiar name. Nevertheless a trace of the original signification may be found in the Song of Moses, Ex. xv. 1-3:—

אשירה ליהוה כי נאה נאה	סוס ורכבו רמה בים
עזי חזרת יה	ויהי לי לישועה
זה אלי ואנוהו	אלהי אבי וארממנהו
יהוה איש מלחמה	יהוה שמו

Here, in a song of victory, we have the formal ascription of the due praise, to the ancestral warrior god, by his name יה. Such, I take it, is the meaning of the invocation יה הודה. It is a shout of triumph, Jahveh is glorified! and in accordance with Hebrew idiom may be employed in anticipation as well as in thanksgiving. Possibly the same form might result from the contraction of יהוה.

The hypothesis that Jahveh was in fact the ancestral deity of the tribe of Judah involves consequences of great importance for the history of religion in Israel.

II.

The union of the twelve tribes, such as it appears in historical times, like the bond which united ancient Hellas, antecedent to and independent of political ties, always involved the presence and the rivalry of two leading elements, the house of Judah and the house of Joseph. It has been held indeed by very distinguished scholars

(Robertson-Smith, *Kinship*, p. 257) "that Judah was not originally included in the name of Israel, but was only a brother tribe." This view is based, I believe, partly upon the absence of Judah from the tribes enumerated in Jud. v, and partly on the opposition of Judah to Israel in the book of Samuel, especially 2 Sam. v. 1. The obscure and mutilated text of the song of Deborah offers a precarious basis for any inference of importance, and the absence of Judah from a struggle in which *ex hypothesi* it was not concerned, hardly proves its complete isolation. The language of the book of Samuel seems explicable upon the supposition that the part is contrasted with the whole, and the whole identified with the remainder, just as in a cricket-match (if I am not mistaken) Yorkshire or Kent or Surrey may be opposed to "All England." Judah in fact was often in the position of the juryman who complained that he had never met eleven such obstinate fellows in his life. But apart from its insufficient basis the view taken by Robertson-Smith is liable to a serious and indeed fatal objection. Israel we know is by ancient tradition identified with Jacob; and Jacob is distinguished from Joseph not only in tradition, but even in the inscriptions of Thothmes III. If, then, Jacob-Israel is to be identified with any narrower group than the whole twelve tribes, it must be with the sons of Leah rather than with those of Rachel. But among the sons of Leah, Judah enjoyed the pre-eminence, and although in a later age when the historical books were compiled, the name of Israel was naturally applied to the kingdom which included the majority of the tribes, in which the primacy was held by the house of Joseph, and more especially by the tribe of Ephraim; yet there can be no justification for transferring this state of things to the earliest times, with the result of confounding Joseph with Jacob, and excluding the sons of Leah from the tribes of Israel.

Looking at the map which represents the geographical distribution of the tribes, it is difficult to avoid the sup-

position that the sons of Rachel, Joseph and Benjamin, imposed their *συνοικισμός* on the rest of Israel, so as to separate the elder from the younger sons of Leah, at the same time dividing Gad from Asher, and Dan, in its original seat, from Naphtali. Among the sons of Leah, as Mr. Jacobs has well pointed out, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah form a distinct group in which the Right of the youngest has passed to Judah. But in the larger Israel the same preference is accorded to Joseph and to Benjamin. Of the southern tribes, Reuben early disappears from the page of history. Simeon is absorbed in Judah. Levi, the tribe of Moses, survives only as a religious guild, which in its subsequent history appears at once devoted to the cultus of Jahveh and especially associated with Judah. In early times the Levites seem to have found a centre at Bethlehem.

There is nothing improbable in the conjecture that the Levite Moses may have adopted as the god of Israel the ancestral deity of the important tribe of Judah. If this hypothesis be entertained it clears up a serious difficulty. Why is the invocation of Jahveh represented in J, Gen. iv. 26 (J²) as beginning with אֱלֹהִים;—a name which must have originally signified the first man;—while in E, Ex. iii, it is for the first time revealed to Moses? The answer is very simple: J expresses the point of view of Judah where the worship of Jahveh was in fact immemorial; E that of Ephraim, where tradition could recall its introduction. A stronger confirmation of the hypothesis could hardly be desired. And if it be accepted we can the better understand not only the enthusiastic Jahvism of David, that typical hero of Judah, but the whole religious history of the southern as contrasted with the northern kingdom. And the enigma in Gen. ix. 25-27 (*J. Q. R.*, X, p. 676) can be brought into still closer connexion with the facts of history if we regard יהוה as primarily the god of the tribe יהודה. Shem and Japheth will then symbolize the house of Judah and that of Joseph, the sons of Leah and those of Rachel.

If, then, the tribal deity of Judah were accepted under the leadership of Moses as the God of Israel, what would be the relation between his worship and that of the gods of other tribes? Prof. J. F. McCurdy (*Expr.*, 4th Ser., IV, 392) lays down "that a certain form of religious worship, or the cult of a particular deity, was bound up with the very idea of national existence, and when the political life of any community was modified by the influence of another community, a religious syncretism was regularly the result." As we have seen, there is some late evidence of such a syncretism in the worship of Gad, and the *אשרה* may well have supplied a connecting-link between the cultus of *אשר* and that of *יהוה*. The tribe of Levi must early have taken *יהוה* to be their god. *אל זבולן* and *אל שמעון* might be regarded as appellations; *אל*, *ישכר אל*, *רניאל*, *נפתליאל*, *מנשאאל* as invocations of *יהוה*; and in general the god of Moses would be considered as *אל אלהי ישראל* (Gen. xxxiii. 20). The masculine *אפרם* might be applied to him. But if the tribe of Benjamin were ever known, as I have ventured to suppose, as *בן ענת*, that goddess could not be identified with Jahveh. And if Reuben were originally *רעובעל*, the identification of *בעל* with *יהוה* was precisely the object against which the prophets of the latter's exclusive cult directed their fiercest polemic. Jahveh, as the symbol of national unity, was essentially *אל קנא*, a jealous god, and the predominance of his worship may have led, at a date prior to the composition of the historical books, to the modification of these two names into the innocent forms in which they have come down to us, while in other instances it has tended to obliterate the original religious significance of the tribal names.

The decay of Reuben is attributed, apparently, to an attempt to assert its authority, as *בעל*, so to speak, over the tribes of Dan and Naphtali, the sons of Bilhah. Such a claim (which cannot be reconciled with the geographical distribution of the tribes in the historical period) must be brought into connexion with the claims of Reuben as the firstborn of Jacob. But these claims may well have led

to a conflict between Reuben and Judah, in which case the victory must have rested with the latter. Note that in the story of Joseph, according to the Elohist, it is Reuben who intervenes to save his life (Gen. xxxvii. 22), but according to the Jahvist, this part is played by Judah (ver. 26, Addis, *Doc. Hex.*, I, 71). In the case of Benjamin, we have a late and indeed untrustworthy narrative (Judges xx) of a conflict between Benjamin and all Israel. But it is not impossible that this may be based on some genuine tradition of a struggle between Judah and Benjamin. "The oldest form of the story may perhaps be derived from J . . . It is, of course, incredible that the tribe of Benjamin was almost exterminated only a generation or two before the time of Saul ; but the events related in these chapters probably fall in a much earlier period" (Moore, *Crit. Comm.*, p. 405).

Analogy makes it probable that like יעקב and יוסף, יצחק אל was originally the invocation employed by some actual tribe or group of tribes (*J. Q. R.*, X, p. 677). If we seek to identify this community, we have to note that יצחק is represented as the brother of Ishmael, the father of Esau and Jacob, and the cousin of Lot. He leads a pastoral life in Gerar and the Negeb, and is especially associated with Beer-sheba. If we regard Judah as the offshoot, and in later times the representative of this stock, we shall not depart widely from the spirit of the narrative. In fact the name יהוה and *a fortiori* that of יהודה, as here interpreted, must have had a definite origin, and may have been preceded by the formula in question.

Who then is Abram? This, according to Mr. Gray, belongs to the most ancient type of personal names. I welcome the possibility that it is that of a real individual, the Moses of an older day, the leader of the first Semitic migration across the Euphrates, the reputed founder of the sanctuaries of Hebron and Beer-sheba. The oldest authentic tradition of Israel is that which tells how their fathers dwelt beyond the flood and served other gods. It is not improbable that tradition might preserve the name of their

leader. Pressed on by their successors, the first immigrants would make their way to the southern extremity of Canaan, and it is known that Abram "was originally a Judæan hero" (*Kinship*, p. 257). He may have been the chief of אַבְרָם. The hypothesis will account for his position at the head of the genealogy of Israel and the cognate tribes.

III.

We have now to consider the maternal side of this genealogy. The patriarchs had to be provided with wives, and in some cases their names may be merely fictitious. Those of Leah and Rachel have been explained by Robertson-Smith in terms of Totemism and the Matriarchal System. Upon this view they would represent tribes of Aramaean origin, probably exogamous, and belonging to an earlier stage of social evolution, presumably therefore to an earlier period of time, than the historical tribes of Jacob and Joseph. From this standpoint, the story of Jacob's wooing would obscurely shadow forth the transition to the patriarchal régime. I should prefer a simpler interpretation. According to the traditions systematized in the Book of Genesis, the ancestors of Jacob have already been brought to Beer-sheba. Driven thence by fear of Esau, he enters into relations of dependence upon Laban the Syrian, and these in turn lead to his marriage first with Leah and afterwards with Rachel. Now we know that Rachel is historically equivalent to the house of Joseph, and we have seen reason to suppose that in like manner Jacob primarily represents the tribes believed to be descended from Leah. The marriage of Jacob and Rachel will then symbolize the *συνουικισμός* of יַעֲקֹב and יוֹסֵפֶה, adding only the valuable fact of the dependence of Joseph upon Aram, while yet in the pastoral stage. All this is probable enough, and the preference assigned to Rachel is a sufficient proof of the origin of the story in Northern Israel, and a presumption of its value so far as concerns the tribe of Joseph. It may point to

intermarriage between that tribe and those of Aram. But the migration of Jacob from the Negeb to this region, though not impossible, is more probably a fiction devised to make him appear as the suitor of the Syrian Rachel, while his marriage with Leah is indispensable, from the genealogical point of view, to account for the place occupied by the remaining tribes within the larger Israel. It remains to consider the ancestry of Rachel.

רחל = ewe, is the daughter of לבן = white, and accordingly the story of Jacob's bargain with Laban, obscure and confused as it is, turns plainly on the distinction between white and particoloured flocks. See Gen. xxx. 28 sq., esp. ver. 35 וַיִּקַּח לוֹ יַעֲקֹב מִקָּל לְבָנָהּ לֶחֶם and ver. 37 וַיִּקַּח לוֹ יַעֲקֹב מִקָּל לְבָנָהּ לֶחֶם. Noting further that לְבָנָהּ is used of the moon in Is. xxiv. 23, xxx. 26, we may next observe that in Gen. xxix. 5 Laban appears as the son of Nahor. He is also represented (Gen. xxiv. 29, 50, 53, 55; xxix. 10-14) as the brother of Rebekah, but it is not expressly stated that he was the son of Bethuel, and in Gen. xxiv, where Laban plays an important part, Bethuel is conspicuous by his absence; even it would seem in v. 50, where as Dillmann suggests, the mention of Bethuel is clearly not original (Spurrell and Bull, in loc.). If we suppose that the marriage of Isaac and Rebekah is an anticipation of that of Jacob and Rachel, pointing to the same historical data, we can understand how it is that Laban has to do duty in two successive generations, in each of which he appears as the nearest male kinsman of the Syrian bride.

Bethuel, however, we are told repeatedly (Gen. xxiv. 15, 24, 47), was "the son of Milcah, which she bare unto Nahor." But בתואל is neither more nor less than the familiar בית אל, i. e. "God's house." Cf. 1 Chron. iv. 30 בְּתוּאֵל; 1 Sam. xxx. 27 בֵּית אֵל; Joshua xix. 4 בְּתוּל, and ibid. xv. 30, LXX. Βαυθαλ; MT. notably כְּסִיל. For the *scriptio defectiva*, cp. ll. 27, 30 of the Moabite Stone, בַּת בַּעֲלָמֶן, בַּת דְּבָלָתָן, בַּת בַּמָּה, and for the nominative termination י the name שְׂמוּאֵל. And Milcah, as Mr. Gray

(*Heb. Pr. Names*, p. 116) following Kuenen suggests, "is a town name in Num. xxvi. 33, and, as such, perhaps an abbreviated form of Beth Milcah, if, as would appear probable, Milcah is a divine name or title. In Gen. xi. 29 Milcah is wife of Nahor . . . and, according to Nöldeke, is "in such a mythical context, scarcely anything else than מלכת, who was worshipped by the Phoenicians." Who then is Nahor? In Gen. xxiv. 10 the עיר נחור is the home of Rebekah, as in xxvii. 43, xxviii. 10, xxix. 4, חרן is that of Rachel. I suspect that both these names bore originally a divine significance¹, and are related to the roots חָרַר "be or grow white," and חָרַר "be hot, scorched, burn," as לָבָן is related to לָבֵן "be white," and לָבֵן, of which the meaning is explained in Gen. xi. 3 נִלְבְּנָה לִבְנִים וְנִשְׂרָפָה לִשְׂרָפָה. You cannot make bricks without baking them, whether in an oven or by exposure to the sun's rays. The notion of brightness supplies a connecting-link between that of whiteness and that of heat.

Nahor, again, is the son of חָרָר, a name perhaps connected with אָרָר and יָרָר². Terah and his sons migrate from אֲרֵר, a name which to a Hebrew must always have suggested the idea of light, to חָרָר. Now Uru and Harran, though far remote from one another, were alike ancient seats of the worship of the moon-god Sin (Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.*, p. 648). Such a string of coincidences cannot possibly be accidental. But this is not all. *Revenons à nos moutons*.

Rachel, as we have seen, is an ewe. But by an ancient mode of speech, reflecting the religion of pastoral life, and so deeply rooted in the *usus linguae*, that it has even survived in the book of Deuteronomy (vii. 13), the ewes of

¹ Cf. חוֹר. Mr. Gray observes, "The term following Beth in place-names is so frequently of a divine character as to lead us to expect it to have been the same even in names where this is no longer manifestly the case" (p. 324). Note that it was apparently in the pass of Beth-horon that Joshua invoked the sun and moon to stand still, according to the סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר, Jos. xi. 11, 12-14.

² Cf. יָרָר, יָרָר, יָרָר.

the flock were known as עֲשֹׁתֵּי הַצֹּאן. The rams, one supposes, must have been בְּעֵלֵי הַצֹּאן. Now "the attributes of the Babylonian moon-god," writes Prof. Sayce (*Variorum Aids to the Bible Student*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1893), "were transferred by the Phoenicians to their Ashtoreth." This explains the concurrence of masculine and feminine epithets in the genealogy just discussed. "In time . . . Ashtoreth came to represent the moon . . . whence the title Ashtoreth-*Karnaim*, 'of the two horns,'" Gen. xiv. 5. This, as Robertson-Smith observes (*Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed., p. 310 and note), is probably derived from the sanctuary of a horned Astarte. "The Astarte of the Northern Semites is essentially a goddess of flocks and herds, whose symbol and sacred animal is the cow, or (among the sheep-rearing tribes of the Syro-Arabian desert) the ewe," *ibid.*, pp. 355, 356. "The sheep-symbols on the Tanith cippi, which are commonly called rams, are hornless, and so presumably stand for ewes. On the other hand, all wild sheep and many domestic breeds are horned in both sexes, so that there is no difficulty about a horned sheep-goddess," *ibid.*, p. 478. Early Man, that versatile and delightful reasoner, argued, the moon has horns, *ergo* the moon is a cow, or a sheep, according to his employment. But it should be noted in passing that the Heb. קַרְנִים appears applicable also to the rays of the sun, and the flashes of the lightning (Davidson on Habakkuk iii. 4).

In the second edition of the *Religion of the Semites* (p. 469) will be found a most instructive paper, read before the Cambridge Philological Society in 1888, which should be carefully perused by any one who wishes to understand the mythical significance of Rachel. The lamented author traces to the Syrians of Harran—the very country and people whence Rachel sprang—"who clung to the ancient Astarte-worship far into the Middle Ages," an annual spring-feast which appears with variations in detail, not only in Cyprus but also in Rome, where it was introduced in the historic period. The rite in question—

"is known to us from a passage in Joannes Lydus, *De Mensibus*, iv. 45 . . . Lydus . . . begins by describing the practices by which women . . . did honour to Venus on the Calends of April. Here, of course, he is speaking of Roman usage. . . . The honourable women did service to Venus ὑπὲρ ὁμονοίας καὶ βίου σώφρονος. . . . This agrees with the worship of Venus *verticordia*, the patroness of female virtue, whose worship Ovid connects with the Calends of April (*Fasti*, iv. 155 sq.), and Mommsen conjectures to have been mentioned under that day in the *Fasti Praen.* . . . The transition from this Roman worship of Venus to the Cyprian ritual of the same day is made by a remark as to the victims proper to the goddess. . . . What he says is that on the Calends of April—a special occasion—Venus was worshipped at Rome with the sacrifices of Juno. And as he is speaking of a ritual in which the worshippers were women, I think we may go a step further, and recall the fact that the Calends of every month were sacred to Juno Lucina, to whom on that day the *regina sacrorum* offered in the Regia a sow or ewe lamb (*Macrob.* i. 15, 19). The functions of Lucina, as the patroness of virtuous matrons and the family life of women, were so nearly identical with those of Venus *verticordia*, that their sacrifices might well be the same."

Discussing the piacular nature of these rites, Robertson-Smith mentions incidentally that

"when Epimenides was brought to Athens to check the plague, he suffered *black and white sheep* to stray at will from the Areopagus, and ordered each to be sacrificed where it lay down, to the nameless deity of the spot (*Diog. Laert.* i. 10). This form of atonement came from Crete, which was one of the stepping-stones by which Oriental influence reached Greece, so that the example is the more appropriate to our present argument" (*ibid.*, p. 476).

Again we meet the herds of Laban.

The reader will by this time have anticipated the conclusion. Rachel is Ashtoreth, the divine ewe, goddess of the flock and of the moon, the type of bride and mother, the patron of the female sex. Her name, her birthplace, and her ancestry, taken in connexion with the known worship of the moon-god and the ewe-goddess by the Syrians of Harran, and the known transference of the attributes of the former to the latter by the Phoenicians, admit no other interpretation. We see now that no epithet could

have been more appropriate to her office than that of Ephrath, "fruitful," or rather "fructifying," whence the leading tribe supposed to be descended from her derived its distinctive appellation, and that the invocation יְסֻפָּא has a special propriety in the mouth of her offspring. We can at the same time understand that the *cultus* of Ephrath might well extend beyond the bounds of Joseph and Benjamin; and if there be anything in the well-known suggestion that Beth-lehem "was originally the sacred place of Lakhmu, a Chaldean god of fertility," it is easy to see why Beth-lehem was also called Beth-Ephrathah (Micah v. 2, LXX), and disputed with the northern Ephrath the possession of Rachel's grave. It should cause no difficulty that the Pillar which marked this spot was at a certain distance from Ephrath, for, as Robertson-Smith has pointed out (*Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed., pp. 172, 489), "the sanctuaries of the Northern Semites commonly lay outside and above the town." The existence of this pillar, or מִצְבָּה, is itself a proof that Rachel received some kind of veneration, and, bearing in mind the legend of her death in childbirth at this very spot, we may fairly conjecture that her aid was invoked by women in labour. The famous *προσωποποιία* of the Second Jeremiah (xxx. 15) shows her as an immortal, grieving at the destruction of her posterity. Compare the apparent reference to invocations of Abraham and Israel in Isa. lxiii. 16 (see Cheyne's note and "Last Words" on this passage; also *Introd.*, pp. 352, 353), and contrast Job xiv. 21, 22. We are now in a position to understand the significance of the story that Rachel on her flight with Jacob carried with her her father's god (Gen. xxxi. 19, 30-35; cf. Ges.-K. § 124 *h* and note). Later on we find the teraphim, an image of human form, in the custody of Michal, Saul's daughter and David's wife (1 Sam. xix. 13). Still later, in the lifetime of Jeremiah, "in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem" (vii. 18), nay, even in exile in the land of Egypt (xliv. 15-25), the women offer incense and cakes and drink-offerings

to the Queen of Heaven (מַלְכֶּת הַשָּׁמַיִם), and attribute to her former favour their lost prosperity. These *sacra* of the women of Israel, brought by Rachel from her Syrian home, were no other than the *cultus* of Ashtoreth. Viewed in this connexion, the parable of Nathan acquires a fresh significance (2 Sam. xii. 2, 3), and even Rachel's excuse to Laban (Gen. xxxi. 35) is seen to be appropriate to her character. No doubt the "honourable women" of Israel served Ashtoreth, or implored the Euhemerized Rachel, with the same purity of intention with which the Roman matrons sacrificed to Venus *verticordia* or Juno Lucina.

The view here set forth of the identity of Rachel-Ephrath with the Syrian goddess is not necessarily inconsistent with the hypothesis that at a still earlier period Rachel may have borne a purely totemistic and matriarchal significance. When she is represented as the daughter of a line of male ancestors whose names are really epithets of the moon, this only means that, Rachel being already identified with Ashtoreth, the attributes of Sin have been transferred to her. According to some authorities (Geo. Smith, *Chaldean Genesis*, pp. 56, 57, 59), Ishtar was Sin's daughter. When, on the other hand, we are told that Beth-Milcah was the mother of Beth-El, this may point to the worship of mother and son as associated deities, itself a token of the matriarchal system (*Kinship*, pp. 179, 292; *Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed., p. 56 sq.). Note here that Milcah is the sister of מַחֲלָה in Num. xxvi. 33, and that in 1 Chron. vii. 18 מַחֲלָה is a daughter of הַמַּלְכֶּת, presumably the מַלְכֶּת הַשָּׁמַיִם. "Hammolecheth" is the sister of Gilead the son of Machir, and Machir is the son of Menasseh by a Syrian concubine (1 Chron. vii. 14). In Numbers, Milcah, Mahlah, &c., are daughters of בְּנֵי-יִצְחָק (should this name be read יִצְחָק¹), and the laws relating to them

¹ Cf. Num. xiv. 9, יִצְחָק, and Gen. xxxi. 42, 53, with Spurrell's note. This passage, like that of Chronicles sup. cit., deals with the relations of Israel and Aram in the borderland of Gilead. Considering that the five matriarchal clans or towns cannot originally have traced their common descent

(xxvii. 1-11 and xxxvi) appear to presuppose a system of inheritance through females, combined with a practice of exogamy. For the legal aspect of Jacob's "beenah" marriage see McLennan, *The Patriarchal Theory*, pp. 44-48. The apparent substitution of אפרם or אפרים for אפרת as the tribal name may point to the change from female to male kinship. At the same time it should be remembered that even in Hosea Israel is sometimes represented as the spouse, sometimes as the son, of Jahveh. It is possible that the change from אפרת to אפרם indicates the victory of exclusive Jahvism, but this is not a necessary supposition, for the masculine invocation אל יוסף is as old as 1500 B.C. On the other hand, the all-but complete obliteration of the divine character of Rachel in the historical books of the Old Testament is a fact of considerable significance. It implies both that those books afford a one-sided view of the traditional popular religion, and at the same time that monotheism was diffused more widely and at an earlier date than some scholars would be prepared to admit.

IV.

There is an undoubted attraction in the hypothesis of a connexion between כן the moon-god of Ur and Harran, and כיני the primitive seat of Jahveh; for the migration ascribed to Abram bridges the distance which separates Horeb from the Euphrates. Abram, as we have seen,

from a male ancestor, it seems probable that צל פחד or צל may have been substituted for הכלה, the Fear of Isaac thus replacing the Syrian goddess. צל seems to point to an actual image, the object of common *sacra*. But is צל really a divine name, or an euphemism, perhaps for בעל, as indeed the assonance suggests? Compare בצלאל, which Cheyne (*J. Q. R.*, X, 570) corrects into הלצאל "God rescues," after the Phoenician personal names הלצנל and הלצנל. With equal justification we might suppose that הלצנל was the origin of צל פחד, and that the כסלצה, which Queen Ma'acah made for the Asherah, was simply a כסלצה, or robe of state. The compiler of the Book of Kings probably took it for an idol, and treated it accordingly.

represents the remote ancestors of Judah, the tribe in our view more especially identified with the *cultus* of Jahveh; the "other god," whom those ancestors are said to have worshipped beyond the river, can have been no other than Sin; and to this deity was addressed the early hymn, composed in the city of Ur, which is thus cited by Professor Sayce:—

Father, long-suffering and full of forgiveness,
 Whose hand upholds the life of all mankind! . . .
 First-born, omnipotent, whose heart is immensity,
 And there is none may fathom it! . . .
 In heaven, who is supreme? Thou alone, thou art supreme!
 On earth, who is supreme? Thou alone, thou art supreme!
 (*Primer of Assyriology*, p. 92.)

Was this, then, the religion of Abram? I fear not; for in the first place we have already seen how the attributes of Sin were transferred to Ashtoreth; in the second place there is but scanty evidence to connect the worship of the moon with that of Jahveh; and lastly we must, I think, on other grounds, seek a somewhat different origin for the latter.

The feast of the new moon, "undoubtedly familiar to the ancient Israelites," is yet "completely ignored in the 'Book of the Covenant' and in Deuteronomy." It makes its appearance in Ezek. xlvi. 6 sq. and in a late stratum of P (Addis on Num. xxviii. 1, 11, vol. II, pp. 430, 431). In other words, it formed a part of the national religion, and of the priestly tradition, but was disapproved by the prophetic reformers. But there is no proof that it was originally a feast of Jahveh at all. And it is not certain that the Sabbath was originally lunar (but see Wellhausen, *Prol. Eng. Trans.*, p. 112 sq.).

Ashtoreth, as goddess of the moon, is naturally associated with the solar Ba'al. But here again there is little evidence to justify us in ascribing a distinctly solar character to Jahveh. In this place it may be right to mention his early identification with Melech, as recipient of the sacrifice

of the firstborn (see esp. Ezek. xx. 26), his connexion with the *ram* (esp. Gen. xxii. 13), with *oxen*, *lions*, and the mythical *cherubim* (1 Kings vii. 29), in the ornaments of the temple and the visions of Ezekiel (chaps. i and x; cf. 1 Kings vi. 23 sq.), to which from the last source (cf. Deut. xxxii. 11) we may also add the *eagle*. Some of these attributes may possess a solar or celestial significance. As a god of herds and flocks, Jahveh assumes the function of Ashtoreth, and the allusion of King Mesha' to עֲשֵׂתִי כַמֶּשֶׁךְ may warn us of the possibility of a similar confusion with regard to the God of Israel. And here perhaps should be placed the "calf" of Beth-El.

When, however, 'Ashtoreth is regarded in her primary character—

Alma Venus . . .

..... quae terras frugiferentes

Concelebras, per te quoniam genus omne animantum

Concipitur visitque exortum lumina solis—

we look for her beloved companion, the divine tree-spirit (as Mr. Frazer has shown), the Semitic Adonis, the Egyptian Osiris. We find him symbolized in the Asherah, in the tamarisk of Beer-sheba, and the thorn of Sinai. Observe that the worship of thorn and tamarisk, like that of the sacred ewe, belongs not to the settled life of cultivated lands, but to the pastoral existence of the nomads of the wilderness, and therefore, as tradition requires, to an early stage in the history of Israel.

According to the hypothesis set forth in this and the foregoing paper on the Tetragrammaton (*J. Q. R.*, X, p. 662) the name יהוה, equally with יְעֻקֵּב and יִסְכָּךְ and with many of the names of the twelve tribes, is simply a predicate of אֱל, a particular mode of invoking the god of the community. In the words of Wellhausen, *Prol. Eng. Trans.*, p. 433, "Jehovah was only a special name of El which had become current within a powerful circle [on the view here advocated, the tribe of Judah], and which on that account

was all the more fitted to become the designation of a national god." He was not a new god, but the god of their fathers. He might be represented by a tree, a serpent, a standard, or perhaps a stone; closed in a chest, "carried about, lifted up, or worshipped," like the Host of a later age (Art. XXVIII of the Church of England). With all this, Moses, it would seem, had no quarrel. He accepted it, one may suppose, as Mahomet accepted the Kaaba. It supplied the indispensable point of contact with the traditions and the modes of thought of his people. *Δὸς ποῦ στῶ καὶ κόσμον κινήσω*. In what, then, did the distinctive character of Jahveh consist? What was the mission of Moses?

The answer to this question, as I conceive, is not new. Moses proclaimed a deity who was at once national, the God of all Israel; therefore exclusive, tolerating no divided allegiance, and distinct from the great powers of nature, whose worship was common to the whole world; lastly, as is required in some degree by the very nature of society, a God of Righteousness, of Social Justice. "The religious starting-point of the history of Israel was remarkable, not for its novelty, but for its normal character. In all ancient peoples there exists a relation between God and the affairs of the nation, and religion is employed as a motive for law and customary morality; in none, however, did the relation exist, or was the motive employed, in such purity and power as in Israel." (I quote Mr. Montefiore's translation of this passage, *J. Q. R.*, III, 267. I am, of course, much indebted to his suggestive statement of the problem.) Here, I think, is the answer to much that is put forward in *The Making of Religion*. What Mr. Lang has done further is to show that, if we may rely upon the evidence which he has adduced, this conception of a Moral Supreme Being is by no means confined to nations advanced in civilization, but occurs independently among many of the lowest savages. If this be so, we may ascribe a moral character to the primitive Semitic El. Upon this view, the work of Moses,

or of Mahomet, would consist in reverting to an earlier and purer faith, and impressing it upon the national consciousness of the Hebrews, or the Arabs. Moses made Israel, Mahomet created Islam.

The religious conceptions of mankind appear to me to express the nature of man's faculties, and reflect the conditions of his existence. Hope, as well as fear, generates expectations which become beliefs. The speculations of the intellect, the creative workings of the imagination, have alike their share in the making of the gods. The Object of Religion participates in the moral nature of the Subject. It is possible to admit this, and yet to attribute a Divine origin to the human mind, or to suppose a Divine influence upon its operations. How far Man's thoughts of God conform, either to the Ultimate Reality or to the Supreme Ideal, is the last problem of the Philosophy of Religion.

NOTE. THE NAME OF LEVI.

Yet another explanation of this name is possible. If we compare the two series, לֵוִי, לֵוִיָּה, לֵוִיָּהוּ, and נָחֵשׁ, נָחֵשֶׁת, נָחֵשֶׁתִּי, it is curious to observe that in the former case the final term represents the World-Serpent of mythical cosmogony, in the latter the Brazen Serpent set up by Moses, presumably as a symbol of Jahveh (2 Kings xviii. 4). The root לָה, we may suppose, describes the coils of the serpent, נָחֵשׁ perhaps the metallic gleam of its scales. Assume now that the tribe of Levi derived its name from a serpent-god (not necessarily a totem), and we shall the better understand why the Levite Moses selected such an emblem for the God of Israel. In Num. xxi. 8 (cf. ver. 6) the נָחֵשׁ נָחֵשֶׁתִּי is described as a שָׂרָף, and we can hardly suppose it unrelated to the anthropomorphic שָׂרָפִים which in the vision of Isaiah are associated with the throne of Jahveh. I do not know what evidence there is that the Brazen Serpent stood "in the royal courtyard" at Jerusalem

(Robertson-Smith *apud* Jacobs, *Archaeol. Rev.*, III, 156). But if so, David may well have removed it thither from Bethlehem, apparently a Levitical centre in the days of the Judges (Moore, *Crit. Comm.*, pp. 371, 408). The reading בֵּית נָחִשׁ in 2 Sam. xvii. 25 is by no means above suspicion (Budde, in loc.). The sacrifice of Adonijah was certainly offered to Jahveh, and if אֶבֶן חֹמֶלֶת really means the Serpent's stone, the serpent was probably the *genius loci* haunting the fountain of En-rogel (*Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed., pp. 168, 172). Of course, the lower may have been taken up into the higher cult. Nahshon, the son of Amminadab, appears as a prince of Judah in the Priestly Code, Num. i. 7; among the ancestors of David in 1 Chron. ii. 10, Ruth iv. 20; while in Exod. vi. 23 he actually figures as the brother-in-law of Aaron. The passage last cited, it is true, is of somewhat uncertain *provenance* (see Addis. in loc.). According to Kuenen (*Hex.*, trans. Wicksteed, p. 330) the name of Aaron's wife is taken "from Levitical genealogies, a number of which were in circulation after the captivity." In any case it may serve to show the relation of Levi to the tribe of Judah, to the house of David, and, shall we add? to the worship of Nehushtan.

G. H. SKIPWITH.